MASTER BAKEWELLS SEA OF ABSURDITIES, CONCERNING SPRINKLING

CALMELY

Driven back by

Peter Chamberlen.

12. *April*, 1650.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX
+*+⁎+*+⁎+*+⁎+*+⁎+*+
XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

London, *Printed by* J. C. *And are to be ſold by* Giles Calvert, *at the* Black-ſpread-Eagle, *at the Weſt end of* Pauls, 1650.

Mr. Bakewells *Sea of Abſurdities concerning* SPRINKLING; *calmely driven back by* Peter Chamberlen, 12 *April* 1650.

MR. *Bakewell*, There was a Letter, with your name ſubſcribed, brought to *Ely* houſe the 24. of *March*, laſt (as I heard) and the ſame was afterwards delivered unto me; whereupon I ſent 4 times to your houſe, to have returned you an Anſwer, and either you were not at home (as the Meſſenger told me) or elſe you would not be at home: ſo that on the laſt Lords day, (7. *April* preſent) which you call the Sabbath or Palm Sunday, (which was the firſt time I was at *Ely* houſe ſince the Letter) I gave a publick Anſwer in the place where it was ſent. Therefore you wrong your Friends, in poſſeſſing them, that you had defied *Iſrael*, and none durſt anſwer you, as your Preamble imports. Nor do you well to charge me with a promiſe I never made. For you neither could tell whether I made any promiſe, (you, nor your Meſſenger, not having ſpoken with me,) nor could you ſo much as know whether I had received your Letter, it neither being delivered unto me, nor to any in my preſence, nor yet left at my houſe. Nor truly, were you ſo civill as to ſend me a Copy of what you printed, and I had not known thereof, if another had not given me one.

You ſay further, that you were requeſted by ſome Friends to publiſh your Letter. I partly believe you are but the *Catts Paw*, by your dabling in *Greek* (p. 6. & laſt line) which probably you underſtood not; and by my Reverend Friend Mr. *Downam's*

vouchsafing you an *Imprimatur*, and your own confession here of your Friends Request, yet I cannot but a little wonder at it. What? That your Ministers should allow a Lay-man to take upon him their Function! and to answer what they durst not! They knew (perhaps) none so bold. ———

Well Mr. *Bakewell*, I shall not be so proud, as because you may be censured by your own party, out of your Element, (under which notion (perhaps) taking me, they permit you to do what you do:) therefore not to grant you an humble and loving Answer; however you are pleased to judge me proud of heart, and taking upon me the Title of *Tyrus*, &c. Truly I am sorry I cannot so behave my self as to have prevented you from any such rash censure, and do but you teach me greater humility, wherein the truth of Christ may not suffer, and I shall be glad to learn of you that meekness and humility, wherein you follow Christ before me. Which nevertheless in this you seeme not to do, *in presuming to answer for* Dr. Gouge, *as supposing your self the abler man, or abler then any of your sprinkling Ministers.*

I must passe by many impertinencies, and touch upon the most material passages of the Letter, that I may avoid the words of rayling, and onely return an Answer in love.

You except against my asking a question of Dr. *Gouge*, because he is ancient. Of whom should men enquire but of the ancient *should not dayes speak, and multitude of yeares teach wisdome*, Job 32.7. Of whom should we enquire, but of those that take upon them the Office? *should not the Priests lips preserve knowledge?* Malach: 2.7. Why man, I sent not to fight with Dr. *Gouge*, and so long the older the better: nor did I confine the question to him, but that others were also lovingly intreated to his assistance. Yet having sufficiently censured and chid me; you will not give me leave to state mine own Question; but pretend to know my meaning better then my self. My Question was, WHETHER THE SPRINKLING OF INFANTS BE OF GOD OR OF MAN? It is the same question which Christ propounded

ded to the Phariſees concerning the Baptiſme of *John*, *Mat.* 21. 25. You have made a Queſtion of your own, WHETHER SPRINKLING THE BAPTIZED BE OF GOD OR MAN, BE THEY INFANTS OR OF FULL AGE? do you mean by Baptized, Sprinkled? as in your 6 page and laſt line you intimate. Then you Tautologize and will ſound thus in plain *Engliſh*, *Whether ſprinkling the Sprinkled be of God or Man?* or would you have thoſe that are baptized already, to be ſprinkled alſo? I pray conſult with your Teachers a little before you either ſtate my Queſtion, or ſtate it in that manner. In the mean time I will ſuppoſe you ſpeak ſenſe, and that (at all adventures) you affirm that THE SPRINKLING OF INFANTS IS OF GOD AND NOT OF MANS INVENTION, which is quite contrary to what Dr. *Gouge* affirmed to ſome. For I have been informed by Mr. *Edw. Barber*, and have it under his hand ſince you printed your Letter, that at 2 ſeverall times, both upon his being ſent unto him by the Biſhops, and one *Marke Whitlock*, to be ſatisfied for taking the Oath *ex officio*: Dr. *Gouge* did acknowledge (not onely Sprinkling) but that baptizing of Infants was a tradition of the Church, and uſed it as one Argument to take that Oath: But to your Arguments.

1. *Arg.* You would prove that *Sprinkling* of Infants is of God, becauſe the Lord foretold that in the times of the Goſpel his *people ſhould be ſprinkled with clean water*. *Ezek.* 36.25. Mr. *Bakewell*, it had been well if you had deſired your Teachers to help you to make a Syllogiſme of it, whereof they that will undertake to diſpute, ought not to be ignorant; but becauſe you may chance not know what belongs to it, aske them whether by SPRINKLING here be meant BAPTISME? Or whether by CLEAN WATER, be meant ELEMENTARY WATER? Or whether by the words (UPON YOU, which you interpret his people) be meant LITTLE INFANTS? Or whether by THEN be meant the TIME OF THE GOSPEL with THE GENTILES, as you likewiſe render it? Or whether this SPRINKLING allude not rather to the SPRINKLING UNDER THE LAW, (*Levit.* 14. 7. *Numb.* 8. 7.)

which they understood distinct from those many Baptismes mentioned in *Heb.* 9. 10. which were amongst them, and did not understand *Johns* or *Christs* Baptisme, which as yet was not? And whether the PURE WATER be not rather the HOLY GHOST in the Language of our Saviour (*John* 7.39?) And whether the time THEN and the People YOU, be not rather the glorious times of the CALLING OF THE JEWES?

I believe these mistakes will rather put them upon a more strict way of keeping the staffe in their own hands, and not suffer Lay-ignorance though never so zealous, Talketive, or Devout, to betray their Cause. For when you or any else have said all you can upon this place, IT IS A PROMISE OF WHAT GOD WILL DO, IT IS NOT A COMMAND OF WHAT MAN MUST DO.

Then you say (Mr. *Bakewell*) that the water in BAPTISME is A SIGNE OF THE BLOOD OF CHRIST: but where doth the Scripture say so? They had under the Law, the SPRINKLING OF WATER. *Levit.* 14. 17. *Numb.* 8. 7. distinct from the SPRINKLING OF BLOOD, *Exod.* 12. 22. and 29. 21. and both distinct from their BATHES AND WASHINGS, *Levit.* 15. 5. 6. 7. 8. 10. 11. 13. 18. 21. 22. 27. And 16. 26. 28. and 17. 15. 16. and *Numb.* 19. 7. 8. 19. and *Exod.* 19. 10. and 29. 4. and 30. 18. 19. and 40. 12. 31. *Levit.* 6. 27. 28. *Deut.* 21. 6. and divers other places. And we have under the Gospel BAPTISME distinct from the SUPPER OF THE LORD. And the Holy Ghost is punctuall, (*John* 19. 34.) that there came out of the side of *Jesus* both *Water* & *Blood*. Now should they have confounded the sprinkling of water with that of blood, or either with their washings, or one with the other under the Law, they could not but have neglected a great part of those Rights and Ceremonies wherein they were to be so exact: And if we also should confound those few Commands which our Saviour left us under the Gospel, we should soone arrive to that spirituall Babel which is so rife in these dayes amongst many who suppose themselves spiritual. Forbeare therefore so boldly to affirm

affirme or inferre that the water in Baptisme is called in *Heb.* 12. 24. *The blood of sprinkling*. But if you will needes finde Baptisme in that Text, find it in our *coming to Jesus the Mediatour of the new Covenant*, from the which the *Blood of sprinkling* is distinguished by a conjunction Copulative (AND). That also of the 10. of *Heb.* 22. must be kept from confusion, and then it comprehends the 2 compleat parts of Baptisme.

1. The work and promise of God in these words. *Our hearts sprinckled from an evill Conscience*, and the work and obedience of men in these words. *Our Bodies washed with pure water.* For IT IS NOT THE WORK OF MAN TO SPRINKLE THE HEART, NOR IS IT THE WORK OF GOD TO WASH THE BODY. 2. GODS SPRINKLING IS EQUIVALENT TO MANS WASHING, In which sense the phrase is used of GODS FINGER, *Exod.* 8. 19. 31. 18. And these two parts are distinctly held forth in many places, *Mat.* 3. *Mar.* 1. *Luke* 3. *I baptize with water, but he shall baptize with the Holy Ghost.* And *Act* 1. 5. *John baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost:* So *Act* 2. 38. *Repent and be baptized, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost.* If either of these be wanting, Baptisme is not compleat. For Christ himself, *who had not the spirit by measure, must be baptized to fulfill all righteousnesse (Mat: 3.) Peter* by *Cornelius* his Companies receiving the HOLY GHOST, judgeth them *thereby fit to be baptized with water: Act* 10. *Who can forbid water that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized.* And on the other side without *fruits worthy of Repentance*, the *Pharisees* shall not be admitted to the BAPTISME OF WATER. (*Mat.* 3. 7. 8.) Nor probably the Eunuch, unlesse he had BELIEVED WITH ALL HIS HEART. *Act* 8. 37. *For it is not the outward washing away the filth of the flesh, but the inward answer of a good Conscience towards God through Jesus Christ*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21.

2. Your second Argument or Article with the latter end of the first, layes down a Rule of Similitude between the signe (or Sacrament, in your phrase) and the thing signified. Consider your own Rule, with SPRINKLING OF A CHILDES FACE,

(which

(which is a Ceremony but lately allowed, by the late *Directory*, and was not allowed (though practiſed) by the *Book of Common Prayer*. Conſider I pray you, whether by your Rule you do not make a *Face-Chriſtian*, yea a *ſpecled face-Chriſtian*, your SPRINKLING being onely on the FACE, and that but *here* and *there* in DROPS; but if you allow BAPTISME to ſignifie the WASHING AWAY OF SIN, as all *Catechiſmes* imply, would you onely waſh away the FACE and OUTWARD APPEARANCES OF SIN, to make an *Outſide-Phariſee-Chriſtian*? or would you have ALL SIN, even the *whole body of Sin waſhed away*? Therefore the *waſhing of the whole Body*, as was appointed by the *Book of Common-Prayer*, and was the COMMAND and PRACTISE of CHRIST and his APOSTLES, and of thoſe learned men whom they commonly call *FATHERS*, is *the right way of adminiſtring the Sacrament*, and not a new-invented way of *SPRINKLING*, which (though practiſed) was *NEVER COMMANDED TILL OF LATE.*

Compare it alſo with thoſe other *REPRESENTATIONS IN BAPTISME*, would you have the Baptiſme of the HOLY GHOST to be but in *DROPS*, and that but in APPEARANCE, on the FACE, or but one *PART*? Or would you be *FILLED* ſo as to have *Rivers of living water flow out of your Belly? John* 7. 39. Would you have your FACE onely BURIED WITH CHRIST IN BAPTISME, or have your FACE onely BAPTIZED INTO HIS DEATH, and have onely your *FACE* to *RISE WITH HIM*, or have onely an *Outſide-ſhew of Death to Sin, and Reſurrection to life in Chriſt*? (*Col.* 2. 12. *Rom.* 6. 34. *&c.*) Or would you make *CHRIST* only a *VISARD FOR YOUR FACE*, to *PUT HIM* only *ON UPON YOUR FACE*? (*Gal.* 3. 27.) Lay your hand upon your heart, and conſider ſeriouſly theſe things.

Then you inſiſt upon the *VISIBILITY OF THE SIGNE OF THE BAPTIZED, &c.* Firſt, conſider your own Practice. Do *INFANTS SEE THE WATER* wherewith they are ſprinkled? Are their *EYES* commonly *OPEN* or *SHUT*? Do any pluck them open? yea, if they were open, would not nature teach them to ſhut them when they felt the drops of water upon them?

them? Or if they open their eyes, know they what water is, or what it meanes? Secondly, Whether is a *Bason of Water*, or a *River* most visible? Is not this like the old Woman that could see the needle, but not the Barne? Thirdly, whereas you say that he who is plunged doth not *see* the *Signe*, if you mean *WATER*, He doth not onely *see* it but *feele* it, and if you mean the *Washing* and *Clensing* of *his Body*, surely they are more likely to see their Bodies clensed that go into a *RIVER*, and afterwards drie themselves and wipe away the filth, then they that onely have their *Face Sprinkled*, which they cannot see without a *Looking-glasse*, (a thing of no use to New borne Infants.) And whereas you say that they cannot *heare* what is said, no more do *Infants*, nor do they *understand* if they *hear* the words; but the baptized according to the Scriptures do both heare the words and *know* them before they are plunged, although pronouncing the *WORDS*, do not the work, but the *Obedience* of being Baptized into the Name of the Lord.

3. Your third *Article* saith, that many were *Baptized in their houses*, and you instance in *Paul*, *Cornelius*, and the Jaylor, for whom you quote *Act* 9. 17. 18. & 16. 25. 48. You do ill (Mr. *Bakewell*) to father so many untruths in print upon the Scriptures. The Scriptures say *NOT* that *PAUL* was *BAPTIZED* in the *HOUSE*: but that *Ananias entred into the House*, and afterwards when the scales were fallen from his eyes, he *arose* and was *Baptized* without saying he was Baptized either in a Tub or Pond, (according to your roving language,) or in a River: or that he was Baptized without Water as the Drie-washing Book of the Doctrine of Baptismes will inferre. You may likewise read it again in *Act* 22. 16. *Paul* was not to sit still to be sprinkled; but, *now up, why tarriest thou? arise and be Baptized, and wash away thy sinnes, &c.* So *Act* 10. *Peter* after having reasoned the business about *Cornelius* and those with him, *who can forbid water, &c?* he commands them to be *Baptized*, but it is *not* said *where*, nor *by whom*. And if you allow any water to be used (as is expressed) you must either suppose it carried up and down with the A-

poſtles in *Aqua-vitæ-Bottles*, or *Roſe-water-Bottles*, to daſh them in the face as ſoone as they had been but taken confeſſing of Chriſt, or that whereſoever they came, they either found or called for a Baſon of water in the firſt place (which we do not read they did) or elſe *the ſame time that would ſerve to fetch water and bring it back, might ſerve them to go to the water.* And in the 16. of the *Acts*, I perceive you do not ſo much as read the 30. verſe, elſe you would never have put in print that the Jaylor and all his were *baptized in the Priſon, quite contrary to the Text*, which ſaith, *that the Jaylor came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out*, at leaſt out of the inner Priſon, *before it is ſaid* that he asked *what muſt I do to be ſaved?* and in the 33. verſe, *he took them the ſame houre of the night, and waſhed their ſtripes and was Baptized, he and all his ſtraightway*, *before* it is ſaid that *he brought them into his houſe, &c.* Nor is it probable that they were *Baptized with water, and the blood* of the *Stripes* of *Paul* & *Silas*. *Abſurdities muſt not be put upon the Scriptures, but the main being expreſſed, the reſt ought to be underſtood, eſpecially being fully expreſſed in other places.* All the following Queſtions therefore denote your extream ignorance both in the Scriptures & in that Ordinance. And your great partiality appears in that you asked not the ſame abſurd queſtions about the waſhing of *Paul* & *Silas*, & the Baptiſm of the Jaylor & his houſhold. As what Veſſel? Who ſhould fetch it? How often emptyed? Did *Paul* ſtand in a Veſſell? How many times went he in? or vvent he in at all? Wherefore all theſe Abſurdities cannot but ſtick faſt in your weak Imagination, till they be all diſſolved in a River, or Sufficient Quantity of Water.

4. In the 4. place, you ſay the Sacrament muſt be adminiſtred Where the Word Is Preached, becauſe that *Mat.* 28. 19. You ſay it is, Preach and Baptize. Here you alſo play the falſe Prophet in your falſe Interpretation and Repetition. For the word is not κηρύξατε, *Preach* but μαθητεύσατε, *Diſcipline* or make Diſciples, nor is it βαπτίζετε, and *baptize* but βαπτίζοντες, *baptizing much leſſe* doth the Text either

either say or inferre that *they must baptize in the same place where they preach: John Baptist*, and *Christ*, and his *Disciples* went up and down preaching the Gospel in the WILDERNES, *Mat.* 3. 1. and *about all Galilee*, *Mat.* 4. 24. and up in a MOUNTAIN. *Mat.* 5. 1. & 10. 7. & 27. & 11. 1. and in a CHARIOT. *Act* 8. 4. 31. & 35. *&c.* But they BAPTIZED in JORDAN. *Mark* 1. 5. *John* 3. 22. in ÆNON. *Jo.* 3. 23. *&c.*

5. Upon the same score of ignorance you have the like troubled fancy as in the 3. Article, about a Rivers banck, or half way in the River, or 2 Persons at least to administer the Ordinance, from all which absurdities you sprinkle your self with Holy water, and rest in a contented ignorance.

6. Against supposed NAKEDNES you alleadge MODESTY, and against CLOTHING you would not have them sit DUNG-WET at meat, and against a *Partiall Cloathing* you alleadge *Aarons Briches*, with many other weak things, even answered in the very readding. For by this you allow not *Jesus*, nor the *Eunuch*, nor all the rest to be *nor Naked, nor Cloathed, nor half Naked and half Cloathed.* And were your modest suppositions true, what think you of CIRCUMCISION? Perhaps when you duly weigh these things, and deny your self-conceits and strange Imaginations, to submit them to the Truths of Scripture, your zeal may be converted into knowledge, which truly is my Prayer for you. For I verily believe you write not in malice to me, though in hard censure.

7. Seventhly, Mr. *Bakewell*, you affirm another untruth of the Scriptures for want of knowledge of the Tongues, owning the error of the Translator. *Mark* 3. 11. where *John* is made to say I baptize *with Water*, and not *in* water, and say you, the Scripture alwayes saith *with* water. Now if you your self were such a *Grecian*, as to be Author sufficient for the *Greek* word βαπτίζω, as you undertake in the last line of the 6. page, you might also be credited here, having the translation

on your ſide, which there you have not: but becauſe I believe you are not, but ſpeak by roat as you are taught, I pray aske your Teachers (who know the Tongues,) and they will tell you, that ΕΝ ὕδατι ſignifieth *in water*, and not *with water*. And *Epheſ.* 5. 26. τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ΕΝ ῥήματι: *with the waſhing of water in the word*. And *Heb.* 10. 22. hath neither *in* nor *with*, onely the *Dative* Caſe, which our language will not render with any propriety. And truly it were well, if thoſe errors which are cauſed for want of a more exact Tranſlation, were taken away by a new Tranſlation. And till you are able to be an Interpreter, it is good to be ſober in making your own Concluſion upon matter of Interpretation; but yield the place to thoſe that are better able, and better gifted: till when, I muſt leave you in the midſt of all your abſurdities which you have framed and affirmed, and not I, nor any one as I know but your ſelfe.

8. Eighthly, you began with a hard word *Analaptiſt*, and you ſhould do wel to know what that word meanes, and how to uſe it, and to whom it belongs, before you undertake to condemn any under that notion. And when you underſtand the true ſignification of Baptiſme, you will not *exact Brick, and allow no ſtraw*, you will not bid one *cut meat without a knife*, you will not expect that men ſhould be *baptized, and not ſuffer them to come into the water*. And for your *Hocus Pocus* of ſaying that Infants are *under* water for being *lower* then that handfull of water held by your Miniſters in ſprinkling, it is too ridiculous, as divers other paſſages, to be either anſwered at all, or at all ſeriouſly anſwered: nor would your Miniſters have pleaded that for an *Argument*.

9. Laſtly, you promiſe to ſhew that *Sprinkling one part* of the Body is *ſufficient*: but you pull in your Arguments with Ropes of Sand.

1. One DROP of water is as truly water as the whole *Ocean*; what followes? Therefore one DROP of water is as SUFFICIENT as the whole OCEAN! For what? To feede *Whales*? To beare

beare great Ships? To vvater the Earth? to vvaſh and bath? no nor to ſprinkle neither. Or vvhat vvould you have to follow? That as one drop of vvater is vvater as vvell as the vvhole Ocean, ſo is one part of the body a Body, as vvell as the vvhole Body? This concludes nothing to your purpoſe. Or that as one drop of vvater is vvater as vvell as the vvhole Ocean; ſo if one part of the body be ſprinkled all the body is ſprinkled. The ſimilitude vvil not hold nor follow: but trie the practiſe of it vvhen your face is foule, vvaſh your feet, and ſee vvhether your face vvill be any vvhit the cleaner.

2. You ſay there is *no meaſure of water preſcribed*, onely it muſt be vvater. No more there is *for your Bread*, yet one drop vvill not ſuffize to make Dowe: nor vvill one drop ſerve to vvaſh your hands or feet, vvhen you go to knead it: and it vvere ridiculous for the Apoſtle to mention that *John* vvas baptizing in *Ænon*, BECAUSE THERE WAS MUCH WATER THERE, if one drop vvould have ſerved the turne; but ſo there be enough it is no matter vvhether it be in *Jordan* or *Ænon*, or the Wilderneſſe. *Act* 8. or the River vvithout the City of *Philippi*. *Act* 16. 13.

3. You ſay (to as little purpoſe) that the baptized may be under one drop as vvell as under a Tunne; ſo he may be under a Tunne as vvell as one drop, and vve are daily under more in the Cloudes: but vvhat vvould you inferre thereon? That a man may be buried and plunged, or drowned vvith one drop, or by being under one drop, as vvell as by being under a Tunne? He may indeed be as drie under a Tunne as under one drop, ſo the Veſſell leake not: in the ſenſe you mentioned laſt of the Childs being under the Miniſters handfull of vvater, but not ſo ſoone buried or plunged vvith one drop as vvith a Tunne of vvater; and if the Sextone afforded but one graine of earth upon each body that vvere to be buried, I believe each Noſtril vvould ſoon complain there vvere not ſufficient.

But

But 4. you as desperately attempt to clear this by the Conference of *Jesus Christ* with *Peter* about the washing of his Feet. *Jo.* 13. 8. Read on to the 10. verse. He that is *Washed* (saith he) or he that is *already Baptized, needeth not save to cleanse or wash his feete, &c:* This shewes (say you, from the 8. verse instancing, *in me* for *with me*, as almost in all the Scriptures you quote, you mistake somewhat) this shewes that washing was sacramentall. If you mean it is a *Sacrament*, why do you not so *practise it?* If it be the *Sacrament of Baptisme*, why do not your *Ministers* wash the *feet of Infants* as *Christ did his Disciples*, rather then *sprinkle the face* onely, which *Christ never did?*

When you have spoken your last, you come with 3. *OBIECTIONS* for plunging, from *Act* 8. 38. *Mat.* 3. 6. & *Rom.* 6. 4. To the first you answer, that *every Pit or River* in those hot Countries were *not alwayes brim-full of water*. Be it so. Therefore every *Pit* (which you make a *Synonyma* to a *River*) was not chosen: but the chief *River Jordan*, and *Ænon*, because there was much water. You say they might go into the *Pit*, and not go into the water. The Lord deliver us from the *Pit* where there is no water (*Jer.* 39. 6. *Zach.* 9. 11.) but the Text answers your Cavel, (if you would at all heed what the word saith) that in the Baptisme of *Jesus* and the Eunuch, where the *manner of Baptizing* is particularly mentioned, they *went both down into the water, and they came up out of the water*, not into the Pit, and out of the Pit. *Mark* 1. 9. 10. *Act* 8. 39.

To the 2. *you affirme*, that the *Greek* word (which I suppose you can neither write nor read, which is βαπτίζω or βαπτίζειν in the *Infinitive*) doth signifie as well to SPRINKLE as to PLUNGE, whereas all the Schollers in *Europe* cannot finde it so used in any *Greek* Author, nor others; but of late some *Latine* Authors (from the practise) have rashly printed what you here affirme. Which if it should be granted, and your Testament so interpreted, heare a little your own Absurdities. *Mat.* 3. 1. *In those dayes came John the* SPRINKLER, preaching

preaching in the Wildernes of Jordan. Then went out to him Jeruſalem and all Judea, and all the Region round about Jordan, and were SPRINKLED *of him in Jordan the River. Mark* 1. 5. *John* 3. 22. *After theſe things came Jeſus and his Diſciples into the Land of Judea, and there he tarried with them, and* SPRINKLED, *verſe* 23. *And John alſo was* SPRINKLING *in Ænon,* BECAUSE *there was* MUCH WATER *there, and they came and were* SPRINKLED.

Mark 1. 19. *And it came to paſſe in thoſe dayes, that Jeſus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was* SPRINKLED *of John* (*in*) *into Jordan. verſe* 10. *And ſtraightway coming up out of the water,* &c. *Act* 8. 30. *And they went down both into the water; both Philip and the Eunuch, and he* SPRINKLED *him. verſe* 39. *And when they came out of the Water, the Spirit caught away Philip. So Gal.* 3. 27. *As many as have been* SPRINKLED *into Chriſt have put on Chriſt, and Col.* 2. 12. BURIED *with him in* SPRINKLING; *wherein alſo ye are riſen with him*: But I confeſſe, this ſort of bettering the Tranſlation, I ſhall not like in my Bible.

Yet not content with all theſe Abſurdities, you ſay you might adde more of *plunging in water*, and *danger of lives*, and *you condemn men of murther* for having plunged in winter, *yet name none* that were murthered, nor executed for that murther, nor is there any proof ſave *yon own Authentick Imagination.*

To avoid the hardſhip of Winter, the *Common-prayer-Book* will tell you in the preamble, that *Eaſter* and *Whitſuntide* were therefore appointed by the Ancients for fit times of Baptiſme. And the *Winter-Baptizing* of Children in *Wales*, will ſufficiently teſtifie that you foiſt in your own untruths, by the ſtrength of your own diſtracted Imagination.

In anſwer to the 3 *Objection* from *Rom.* 6. 4. you would take a great advantage, becauſe there is *no mention of water*, and will make it a drie Baptiſme. When you bid your man *waſh your Cup*, or *Glaſſe*, unles you bid him *do it with water*, doth it ſignifie nothing?

nothing? But let him that is diligent read the Texts, *Rom.* 6. 4. *Col.* 2. 12. 1 *Cor.* 1. 8. and satisfie themselves.

To as little purpose do you bring in all the other places of Scripture, and therefore I shall trouble my self no futrher in the particulars of them. Nor do I intend further to be at Charges of printing a satisfaction to every one that Scribles, after having spent and lost so much for the publick, and repayed with so much injustice and ingratitude. Nor will I meddle at present with the lawfullnesse or unlawfulnesse of your Ministry, which you bring in by head and shoulders.

Therefore you may well perceive by my patience in answering your weak *Arguments*, and by my waving all your words of provocation and censure, as of *Pride*, like *Tyrus*, *Questions of strife*, *Janglings*, *that I know nothing* (P. 2.) *Popish Pilgrimage*, (P. 4.) *to abide in the Asse or with the Asse*. (P. 8.) *and his invention who was a murtherer*. (P. 7.) *Anabaptists*. (P. 6.) *mad and drunk*. P. 3.) *Dippers plunged in a Sea of Absurdities* (in the Title.) *Renouncing of Baptisme*, *denying of God*, *Devills*, *Heaven*, *Hell*, *Grace*, *Glory*, *and the like*; that I am not al ogether so proud as you censured me, but that I desire in meekness and lowlinesse of Spirit to win you and all of your opinion (not to mine, but) to the truths of God, which the Lord grant through *Jesus Christ*, *Amen*.

FINIS.

The late coming forth of this Impression is to be amongst the Errata of the Printer: *He that desires to be satisfied of the point*, *may read the Scriptures*, *and the Disputes between Mr.* Denne *and Mr.* Tombes, *Dr.* Featly *and Mr.* Marshall. *And Mr.* Blackwells *storming of* Antichrist. *And Mr.* Laurence *his Treatise of* Baptise. *Or the Book entituled the Vanity of Childrens Baptismes*, &c. *But they that are like Gallie* (*Act* 14. 15. 16. 17. 18.) *may let all alone*.